Affirmative Action Plan
for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies’ affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government.

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
   a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) Answer No
   b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Answer Yes

*For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
   a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) Answer Yes
   b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) Answer Yes

CBP’s population of GS-11 to SES employees only has 10.49 percent PWD, which is less than the 12 percent goal.

CBP’s population of GS-1 to GS-10 employees only has 1.18 percent PWD, which is less than the 2 percent goal. CBP’s population of GS-11 to SES employees only has 0.60 percent PWTD, which is less than the 2 percent goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targeted Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical Goal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades GS-1 to GS-10</td>
<td>7917</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades GS-11 to SES</td>
<td>55581</td>
<td>5830</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

HRM hosts an internal webpage that lists the twelve percent and two percent hiring goals.

Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.
A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

1. Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

   Answer  No

There are three RA Coordinators and an Acting Supervisory RA Coordinator in PDO. Additionally, there is a detailed RA Coordinator to assist with processing. Implementation of the initiative includes the following areas: 1) PDO currently has three vacant positions that need to be filled. This upcoming fiscal year will focus on ensuring full employment of the RA team. Once full staffing is obtained, PDO anticipates it will have better and more efficient implementation of its disability program. 2) During this past fiscal year, a workforce analysis revealed that the RA team needs additional positions in sufficiently perform its functions. Currently, these additional positions are being sought.

2. Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency’s disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Program Task</th>
<th># of FTE Staff By Employment Status</th>
<th>Responsible Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Barriers Act Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing applications from PWD and PWTD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 508 Compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes”, describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

   Answer  Yes

Three RA Coordinators and one detailed RA Coordinator in PDO continued to receive on-the-job training during FY 2021. This included training on conducting intake of RA requests, processing RAs within CBP, conducting interactive dialogues, and record keeping in Microsoft Sharepoint, which CBP uses to track RA requests. Executive Order 13548 requires HR personnel to complete disability training. At the end of FY 2021, 8 percent of CBP’s HR staff had completed the DHS mandated Employment of Individuals with Disabilities: A Roadmap to Success course for the August 1, 2020 through July 31, 2022 training period. Reminder
notifications will be sent to all required staff six weeks from the training deadline to complete the course. Two Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) webinars (February and May 2021) were announced to both HR and office mission support staff. The webinars provided an overview of the WRP database, Schedule A and how to navigate the database for qualified students/graduates with disabilities. CBP human resources staff will continue providing Schedule A education sessions and promoting webinars on various subjects on disability employment.

**B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer: No

Pursue and investigate the establishment of a RA Central Fund; proactively plan for vacancies and potential shifts in the composition and increasing workload of Disability Program staff; secure additional positions; initiate requests for personnel action; in addition to full-time employment opportunities, announce part-time and job sharing opportunities to bolster Disability Program staff; make a request to use hiring flexibilities when a critical hiring need or severe shortage of candidates exists in the disability program. Explore the possibility of using special hiring authorities (such as Schedule A) to expedite onboarding. Explore the possibility of detailing additional individuals to the disability program to assist with workload. CBP is committed to promoting career opportunities to diverse candidates through virtual hiring events, social media, as well as paid and unpaid advertising efforts. CBP leveraged contracted vendor support to provide advertising through media buys with Equal Opportunity Publications, including STEM Workforce Diversity, Careers & the Disabled, and numerous other diversity specific publications with articles and advertisements that highlight CBP employee diversity and career opportunities. CBP remains committed to expansion of outreach efforts to increase diversity within the ranks of CBP employees including persons with disabilities during FY 2022.

**Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</th>
<th>B.4.a.10. to effectively manage its reasonable accommodation program? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4)(ii)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If “no”, please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DHS Customs and Border Protection

Brief Description of Program Deficiency

D.1.c. Does the agency conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C)]

Objective

Update CBP’s exit survey to include questions on the improvement on recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention, and advancement of persons with disabilities.

Target Date

Sep 30, 2023

Completion Date

Planned Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Planned Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify DHS exit survey questions on improvement on recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention, and advancement of persons with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify relevant points of contact for CBP exit survey and current implementation of the survey to departing employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 31, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin discussions with CBP exit survey team and the Privacy and Diversity Office for updating exit survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 30, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit survey questions on improvement on recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention, and advancement of persons with disabilities for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 30, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess progress and identify any follow up actions necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 30, 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roll out updated CBP exit survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>October 2021: • Received a copy of the DHS exit survey questions. • Identified relevant points of contact for CBP exit survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

The Selective Placement Program The Selective Placement Program (SPP) Coordinator is a lead HR Specialist (Recruitment and Placement) who monitors a central mailbox dedicated to the Agency’s Selective Placement Program. The SPP mailbox helps applicants understand their non-competitive eligibility, what positions are aligned with their skills and abilities, resume writing, and CBP’s hiring process. The mailbox also allows applicants to speak directly with a highly trained Specialist about their questions and concerns. Recruitment and Outreach CBP continues to conduct e-Recruiting and outreach to college career services offices, vocational rehabilitation agencies, the disabled veteran community, and affinity organizations throughout the country. Information shared consists of links to current job opportunity announcements along with Selective Placement and Disability Employment Program information. The CBP Veterans Employment Program Manager (VEPM)’s outreach resulted in over 1,000 applicant leads where approximately 20 percent applied to a position both competitively and through the SPP. HRM staff participated in well-attended diversity and disability career fairs such as the Careers and the DisABLED Virtual Career Fair in July, and the Career Eco Diversity & Inclusion Virtual Career Fair in September. Participants were provided with information regarding the CBP SPP and were directed to CBP’s Talent Network form to learn about future career opportunities. The SPP Coordinator and disability recruitment coordinator participate in vocational rehabilitation agency job club meetings (at least once a quarter) to brief on the agency mission, the various non-frontline career opportunities along with information regarding the selective placement program, i.e., the application process, ideal resumes, and recommendations on how to become a highly qualified applicant referral. The staff met with Virginia Department for Aging & Rehabilitative Services Division of Rehabilitative Services staff and clients in both March and July. Three members of the Agency’s recruitment team and one member of the Office of Information Technology participated in mock interviews with Gallaudet University (the college for the deaf and hard of hearing). CBP plans to continue to participate in such school events to brand itself on campuses and encourage students to consider the Agency for both internships.
and Federal careers upon graduation. WRP The annual WRP mass email was sent to all supervisors prompting them to use the database as a tool to recruit students and graduates with disabilities. Staff conducted resume searches of the database to assist program offices in filling vacancies such as a paralegal specialist and staff assistant. During Disability Employment Awareness Month, additional strategies were implemented to promote the database including a marketing campaign that consisted of a CBP Internet article spotlighting an employee who was hired from the WRP, a mass e-mail alerting Agency staff to review the article and an Internet digital system bulletin promoting the message to create awareness of the database. In FY 2022, CBP will continue to encourage use of the WRP by promoting training webinars, posting articles, and conducting resume mining for entry-level positions. DoD SkillBridge Internship Program The VEPM partnered with the Department of Defense to implement the internship program for transitioning service-members with and without anticipated service-connected disabilities to be piloted throughout CBP headquarters divisions for mission support careers from the GS-7 through GS-14 levels. Department of Veterans Affairs Non-Paid Work Experience (NPWE) During FY 2021, CBP selected 10 veterans for a myriad of mission support internships. Eight of the veterans are currently working in CBP program offices throughout the country and two veterans were hired from their NPWE internships. NPWE interns are veterans with a service-connected disability of 10 percent or more. Resume Mining The Office of Personnel Management USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal is used to conduct resume mining of individuals of who have self-certified themselves as Schedule A or 30 percent or more veteran non-competitive eligible and has become a viable tool for assisting hiring managers in locating qualified persons with disabilities.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency’s use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce

In addition to promoting the WRP database, program managers and servicing HR specialists brief hiring managers and mission support staff on the use of various hiring flexibilities such as Schedule A and veterans noncompetitive hiring authority. Briefings outline how the hiring authorities are both an expeditious form of recruitment and that it assists with improving workforce diversity. Due to the success with using non-competitive recruitment, hiring officials have become more inclined to request Schedule A and 30 percent or more veteran applicant referrals for consideration when filling positions from the GS-7 through the GS-13 level. In FY 2021, there were 56 hires from the Schedule A Hiring Authority which is 1.54 percent of the Federal Government Schedule goal of 2 percent of all new hires. Although aggregate numbers declined from 66 in FY 2020 (1.25 percent), hires gradually increased by .29 percent. In FY 2021, there were 71 hires identified as 30 percent or more disabled veterans, which is less than the 84 hired in FY 2020.

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual’s application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

The Selective Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC) reviews the resumes of applicants from the Agency’s SPP mailbox and determines if there are positions available that meet the applicants’ skillset. After verifying the Schedule A documentation, the SPPC reviews the resumes to determine if the applicants meet the basic qualifications of a standing vacancy and refers the resumes to an office’s servicing HR Specialist for consideration. In FY 2021, over 4,409 applications from qualified applicants with disabilities and 30 percent or more Disabled Veterans were referred to the selecting officials. Qualified applicants who apply directly to an announcement are placed on a non-competitive eligible Schedule A list. HR Specialists are instructed to provide managers with any noncompetitive lists prior to referring competitive eligibles (those who applied under an announcement).

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If “yes”, describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to provide this training.

Answer Yes

In FY 2020 CBP added the course Employment of People with Disabilities: A Roadmap to Success to its training system as a mandatory course for all supervisors and HR staff. During FY 2021 1,060 supervisors and 45 Human Capital professionals took this training. The CBP Hiring Center holds an annual hiring workshop and promotes the use of Schedule A to CBP Program Offices.

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS
Describe the agency’s efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

In FY 2021, CBP continued to conduct e-recruiting and outreach to college career services offices, vocational rehabilitation agencies, the disabled veteran community and affinity organizations throughout the country. Information shared consists of links to current job opportunity announcements along with Selective Placement and Disability Employment Program information. Staff routinely conducts presentations to transitioning military and other military organizations and to both the staff and clients of vocational rehabilitation agencies. CBP’s diversity recruitment plan identifies organizations to attract qualified persons with disabilities: vocational rehabilitation centers, college, affinity groups and military organizations.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

   a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer No
   b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer Yes

   Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. There was a trigger for new hires of PWTDs in the permanent workforce: 0.72 percent is below the 2 percent goal. Throughout Part J, statistics marked with * have a basis that is too low to be meaningful. i.e., if the benchmark is 2%, the denominator must be 50 for the numerator to be one or more people. For 12% the denominator only needs to be 8. If the denominator is below these values, the result is not meaningful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targeted Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Workforce (%)</td>
<td>Temporary Workforce (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Applicants</td>
<td>49254</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Qualified Applicants</td>
<td>20706</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of New Hires</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
   b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

   Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. 1881: 0 percent PWD selected < 31.03 percent PWD qualified. 1895: 2.50 percent PWD selected < 6.60 percent PWD qualified. 0.16 percent PWTD < 2.00 percent PWTD*. 1896: 3.13 percent PWD selected < 4.11 percent PWD qualified. 0.42 percent PWTD < 2.00 percent PWTD*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targetable Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hires (%)</td>
<td>New Hires (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical Goal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 AGRICULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targetable Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hires (%)</td>
<td>New Hires (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical Goal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 INVESTIGATOR</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 AIR INTERDICTION AGENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889 IMPORT SPECIALIST</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895 CBP OFFICER</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896 BORDER PATROL AGENT</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD)  
      Answer  Yes

   b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)  
      Answer  Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. 0401: 0.71 percent PWD < 3.94 percent PWD. 0.24 percent PWTD < 0.85 percent PWTD. 1801: 7.33 percent PWD < 17.54 percent PWD. 1881: 0 percent PWD < 14.36 percent PWD. 0 percent* PWTD < 0.17 percent PWTD. 1889: 5.18 percent PWD < 18.32 percent PWD. 1895: 1.87 percent PWD < 5.97 percent PWD.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)  
      Answer  Yes

   b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)  
      Answer  Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. 0401: 0 percent PWD < 0.71 percent PWD. 0.24 percent PWTD < 0.31 percent PWTD. 0.18 percent PWTD < 0.24 percent PWTD. 1801: 1.83 percent PWD < 7.33 percent PWD. 0.92 percent PWTD < 1.47 percent PWTD. 1881: 0 percent PWD < 0 percent PWTD. 0 percent* PWTD < 0 percent PWTD. 1889: 0 percent PWD < 5.18 percent PWTD. 0 percent* PWTD < 2.77 percent PWTD. 1895: 0.73 percent PWD < 1.87 percent PWTD. 0.18 percent PWTD < 0.31 percent PWTD. 1896: 1.29 percent PWD < 4.83 percent PWTD. 0.35 percent PWTD < 0.36 percent PWTD.

### Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

#### A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

Although there is no formal advancement program plan specifically for PWDs, including PWTDs, CBP program offices regularly promote their career opportunities for both competitive promotions and details to Agency staff via its CBP Postmaster distribution.
B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

1. Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

The CBP Mentoring Program allows all CBP employees to navigate challenging career opportunities and develop well-balanced work and personal lives through mentoring relationships. The program connects experienced personnel with those looking for advice and discussion, and facilitates self-directed learning through the sharing of institutional and personal knowledge. In the five years since the program launched, more than 3,181 CBP employees participated in the program as mentees, and over 2,879 employees have volunteered their time as mentors to give back to CBP and its employees. There were 1,553 ongoing or concluded mentor-mentee pairings in during FY 2021. This number doesn’t reflect participants who departed the program or CBP during FY 2021.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Development Opportunities</th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>PWD</th>
<th>PWTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants (#)</td>
<td>Selectees (%)</td>
<td>Applicants (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Programs</td>
<td>5537</td>
<td>Selectees (%)</td>
<td>Applicants (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Career Development Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
   b. Selections (PWD)  Answer N/A

CBP does not currently have any reportable career development programs as currently defined under MD-715.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
   b. Selections (PWTD)  Answer N/A

CBP does not currently have any reportable career development programs as currently defined under MD-715.

C. AWARDS

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD)  
Answer  Yes  

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)  
Answer  Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. Time Off Awards: Time-off awards of 1-10 hours: 2.99 percent of permanent PWTDs received this, whereas 5.04 percent of the permanent workforce did. Time-off awards of 11-20 hours: 2.76 percent of permanent PWTDs received this, whereas 3.37 percent of the permanent workforce did. Cash Awards: Cash Awards $2000 - $2999: 17.92 percent of permanent PWDs and 16.78 percent of permanent PWTDs received this, whereas 20.15 percent of the permanent workforce did. Cash Awards $3000 - $3999: 9.16 percent of permanent PWDs and 9.20 percent of permanent PWTDs received this, whereas 10.53 percent of the permanent workforce did. Cash Awards $4000 - $4999: 1.45 percent of permanent PWDs received this, whereas 1.52 percent of the permanent workforce did. Cash Awards $5000 or more: 0.20 percent of permanent PWDs and 0 percent of permanent PWTDs received this, whereas 0.28 percent of the permanent workforce did.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-Off Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

   a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer Yes

   b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. Quality Step Increases: 0.19 percent of permanent PWDs received this, whereas 0.30 percent of the permanent workforce did. Performance Based Pay Increases: 0.04 percent of permanent PWDs and 0 percent of permanent PWTDs received this, whereas 0.17 percent of the permanent workforce did.

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If “yes”, describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

   a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer No

   b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

This information is not currently tracked and would include smaller programs at a local level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. PROMOTIONS

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. SES
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
   b. Grade GS-15
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
   c. Grade GS-14
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
   d. Grade GS-13
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. a. N/A b.i. 3.07 percent of qualified internal applicants were PWD, which is less than 11.35 percent in the relevant applicant pool. b.ii. 0.89 percent of selected internal applicants were PWD, which is less than the percentage that qualified. c.i. 1.92 percent of qualified internal applicants were PWD, which is less than 10.10 percent in the relevant applicant pool. c.ii. 1.49 percent of selected internal applicants were PWD, which is less than the percentage that qualified. d.i. 1.73 percent of qualified internal applicants were PWD, which is less than 6.63 percent in the relevant applicant pool. d.ii. 0.83 percent of selected internal applicants were PWD, which is less than the percentage that qualified.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. SES
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A
   b. Grade GS-15
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No
      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes
   c. Grade GS-14
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  
Answer  Yes

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)  
Answer  No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  
Answer  No

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements.  
a. N/A  
b.ii. 0 percent of selected internal applicants were PWTD, which is less than the 1.11 percent that qualified.  
c.i. 0.71 percent of qualified internal applicants were PWTD, which is less than 0.78 percent in the applicant pool.  
c.ii. 0.50 percent of selected internal applicants were PWTD, which is less than the percentage that qualified.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWD)  
Answer  No

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD)  
Answer  No

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD)  
Answer  No

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)  
Answer  Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements.  
d. 7.69 percent of GS-13 new hires were PWTD - less than the 7.91 percent of PWTD among qualified applicants.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)  
Answer  No

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD)  
Answer  No

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD)  
Answer  Yes

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)  
Answer  Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements.  
c. 0 percent of GS-14 new hires were PWTD - less than the 2.09 percent of PWTD among qualified applicants.  
d. 0 percent of GS-13 new hires were PWTD - less than the 1.28 percent of PWTD among qualified applicants.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)  
Answer  Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)  
Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)  
Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)  
Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)  
Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)  
Answer No

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. a.i. 3.10 percent of Executive applicants were PWDs, which is less than 11.42 percent PWDs in the applicant pool. a.ii. 0.96 percent of Executive selectees were PWDs, which is less than the percent of qualified applicants. b.i. 1.30 percent of Executive applicants were PWDs, which is less than 7.54 percent PWDs in the applicant pool. b.ii. 0.77 percent of Executive selectees were PWDs, which is less than the percent of qualified applicants. c.i. 5.49 percent of Executive applicants were PWDs, which is less than 13.79 percent PWDs in the applicant pool.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)  
Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  
Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)  
Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  
Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)  
Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  
Answer Yes

Note: The applicant flow data below reflects all certificates that closed in FY 2021 and have been audited. The results may not include all relevant announcements. a.ii. 0 percent of Executive selectees were PWTDs, which is less than the 1.07 percent of qualified applicants. b.i. 0.41 percent of Managerial applicants were PWTDs, which is less than 0.54 percent PWTDs in the applicant pool. b.ii. 0.38 percent of Managerial selectees were PWTDs, which is less than the percent of qualified applicants.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)  
Answer No

b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)  
Answer No

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)  
Answer Yes
8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)  
   Answer  No

   b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)  
   Answer  Yes

   c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)  
   Answer  No

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable accommodation program and workplace assistance services.

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If “no”, please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

   Answer  No

In FY 2021, CBP converted 51 Schedule A employees to competitive positions. 39 percent of the Schedule A employees who were eligible for conversion by August 1, 2021 had not been converted by the end of FY2021. CBP HR staff reminds supervisors twice a year about employees eligible for conversion to competitive status. At that time, management may inform HR that they require more time to observe the employee’s performance before requesting the conversion.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

   a. Voluntary Separations (PWD)  
   Answer  Yes

   b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)  
   Answer  Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separations</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Reportable Disabilities %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disabilities %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Removal</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Resignation</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

   a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD)
      Answer Yes

   b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)
      Answer Yes

a. 8.51 percent of CBP’s PWTDs in the permanent workforce voluntarily separated, whereas 4.73 percent of the permanent workforce voluntarily separated. b. 0.46 percent of CBP’s PWTDs in the permanent workforce were involuntarily separated, whereas 0.38 percent of the permanent workforce were involuntarily separated.

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

In the permanent workforce, 13.64 percent of the removals were PWDs and 0.83 percent were PWTDs, 17.25 percent of the resignations were PWDs and 0.67 percent were PWTDs, 13.21 percent were PWDs and 1.54 percent were PWTDs, 18.48 percent of Other Separations were PWDs and 1.06 percent were PWTDs. PDO is working with HRM to expand the exit survey questions so that they can tell us more about why our PWDs and PWTDs are separating at a rate that is higher than is explained by their participation rate in the workforce.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

1. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

https://www.cbp.gov/site-policy-notices/accessibility

2. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.


3. 
Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

Policies and Practices The following are areas that CBP is currently engaged in the active enforcement of the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA): a. Design Standards - General statement in its facility as follows: The ABA Accessibility Standard, 36 CFR Part 1191, Appendices C and D, applies to Federal construction begun after May 8, 2006. b. SOW – Current SOW contain accessibility requirements for all new construction and renovation projects. c. Facility Condition Assessments – Reports Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) deficiencies or if additional studies are required. d. GSA Support – GSA requires all designs and renovations to comply with ABA standards. e. Team Members – CBP has employed Architects with skill sets to support and review compliance of ABA standards on our projects. Programs The CBP Design Standards for Field Operations, U.S. Border Patrol, and Air and Marine Operations facilities cite compliance with the ABA, and considers exceptions cited in ABA section 203. Statements of Work for operational services, maintenance contracts, and construction contracts include requirements for compliance with the ABA. The Facility Condition Assessment program requires assessment and reporting of ABA non-compliance as deficiencies for each facility. ABA non-compliance is reported as an opportunity for corrective action within the TRIRIGA facility management system and acted on as part of the funding allocation for repair projects. OFAM conducts annual portfolio investment reviews to identify facility sustainment and operational requirements, including those involved accessibility compliance and improved accessibility components. The list of improvement projects is extensive. OFAM registered architects review each executed project for code and ABA compliance. Approval of each project is required by the position description of the Chief Architect. OFAM provides immediate response and corrective action for requests or complaints received. All new construction, renovation, and alteration projects in the National Capital Region include applicable code requirements for accessibility including modifications needed for any specific RA to support specific employees. Renovations to restrooms within the Ronald Reagan Building, which began in December, 2021, will include updated accessibility features.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

1. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

42.81 business days (176 requests by current employees that resulted in an approval or denial). This is a sharp improvement from last year, despite the fact more cases were processed. Last year there were 159 requests processed in 56.7 days. This year, there were 10 percent more requests but they were processed 25 percent faster.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency’s reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

During FY 2021, CBP provided CBP RA Interactive Process for Supervisors and Managers Training via both in-person and webinar capabilities. Specific training was also provided to certain groups within CBP (such as OCC or HRM) on an as needed basis. CBP is updating its RA procedures to assist with better processing.

D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.

Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

CBP has policies and procedures in place to address the needs of individuals who request PAS.
Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the governmentwide average?
   
   Answer: No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?
   
   Answer: Yes

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

   There was one finding of discrimination in FY 2021 with harassment based on disability status as an issue. Corrective measures included: • Engaging in the interactive process with the Complainant and providing a reasonable accommodation; • Conduct a supplemental investigation on compensatory damages; • Pay compensatory damages; • Training; • Consider taking discipline against responsible officials (final decision pending); • Opportunity for attorney’s fees; and, • Posting notice for 60 days.

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?
   
   Answer: No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?
   
   Answer: Yes

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

   There was one finding of discrimination in FY 2021 involving a failure to provide a RA. Corrective measures included: • Training; • Consider taking discipline against the responsible officials (pending final decision); • Conduct a supplemental investigation on compensatory damages; • Opportunity and payment for compensatory damages; • Opportunity for attorney’s fees; and • Posting notices for 60 days.

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.

   1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?
      
      Answer: Yes

   2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?
      
      Answer: Yes

   3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments.
STATEMENT OF CONDITION

That was a trigger for a potential barrier:

Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.

How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?

Source of the Trigger:

Specific Workforce Data Table:

Other

Workforce Data Table - B1

RA processing time frames.

STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:

Barrier Group

People with Disabilities

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:

Barrier Analysis Process Completed?: Y

Barrier(s) Identified?: Y

Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Name</th>
<th>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice - Issuing Decisions</td>
<td>Practice – Managers are not documenting or issuing decisions in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</th>
<th>Date Modified</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Objective Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2018</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>06/30/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>To issue written determinations in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible Official(s)

Title: Director, Diversity and EEO Division

Name: Darlene Sedwick

Standards Address The Plan?: Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Planned Activities</th>
<th>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</th>
<th>Modified Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/30/2018</td>
<td>Conduct internal systematic review of policy, procedures, and practices for bottlenecks (i.e. establish specific time frames for review)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2018</td>
<td>Update agency policies and MOUs, and responsible roles. May include potential negotiations with unions (i.e. Adopt simplified forms to replace template letters and automate processing for Decision maker).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09/30/2019</td>
<td>09/30/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Submit draft RA Policy for program office review and concurrence.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
<td>11/30/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Planned Activities</th>
<th>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</th>
<th>Modified Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2022</td>
<td>Create a communication Plan.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/30/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/2023</td>
<td>Provide training to managers and supervisors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report of Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Conducted internal systematic review of policy, procedures, and practices for bottlenecks (i.e., establish specific time frames for review) and identified need for additional RA Coordinators to address backlog. An additional RA Coordinator was brought onboard in August 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2020        | • New RA procedures were submitted for final approval.  
              • A new supervisory RA Coordinator and RA Coordinator were brought onboard. |
| 2021        | • Detailed additional employee to aid with processing.  
              • Improved RA processing time by 25%.  
              • Cleared majority of backlogged cases. |

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

Continued staffing turnover and required coordination across organizational elements. Reorienting and organizing the RA team to improve efficiencies.

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barrier(s).

A review of policies, procedures, and practices identified need for additional Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators to address the backlog in reasonable accommodation requests based on a disability. Planned activities will also improve timeliness of accommodation requests. Future plans will involve streamlining the RA process through increased use of standardized forms.

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

New Agency policy regarding accommodation process has been submitted and is awaiting final approval. This is anticipated to be completed by the end of FY 2022. Agency will explore the possibility of further improvement of the accommodation process to improve timeliness.